

## REMARKS

The Office Action in rejecting the majority of the claims, and in particular, independent claims 1 and 15 relied solely upon Brum (4,852,455) as anticipated under 35 USC 102(b).

Claim 1 specifies that the apparatus includes;

- a cable de-bailer 22 which is rotatably mounted within a housing 3 having a cable discharge opening 25;

- a shaft 36 is independently rotatably mounted within the cable de-bailer; and

- a spool 46 for reciprocating movement along the shaft as the de-bailer rotates.

Independent claim 15 specifies that the system includes;

- a de-bailer 22 rotatably mounted within the housing 3 for unwinding the cable 7 from the spool 46;

- a shaft 36 rotatably mounted within the de-bailer; and

- the spool being rotatably fixed on the shaft and reciprocally movable therealong;

It is respectfully submitted that Brum in no way contains these elements. Brum does not contain a rotatable cable de-bailer of any type, nor a shaft independently rotatably mounted within the cable de-bailer. Brum does include a rotatable spool 29 which stores a length of towing cable. Applicant's spool 46 as defined in claims 1 and 15, is fixed against rotation and only reciprocates along shaft 36 as the cable is unwound. In Applicant's apparatus and system, the de-bailer 22 rotates about the spool and shaft and removes the cable from spool 46 which only reciprocates along the shaft. This is clearly shown in Fig 3.

Brum does have a spool 29 which has an axial bore 31 through which is directed the force from a cavity charge 33 for expelling the decoy 13 from the

canister 11. There is no separate shaft extending through the spool. The cable in Brum extends through an aperture 65 formed in a fixed spacer bushing 60 which extends between fixed end plates 36 and 63. Thus, clearly Brum does not have the various elements discussed above which are set forth in claims 1 and 15, nor does the Brum mechanism function in a manner similar to that of Applicant's invention. In Brum, the cable is unwound through a stationary bushing 65 as the spool 29 rotates in a non-reciprocating manner on a pair of end bearings 43 and 45 which prevent any axial movement of the spool. This is completely different from the structure of Applicant's invention. In Applicant's device, the de-bailer rotates about a spool which reciprocates along a shaft.

Thus, clearly Brum does not show or suggest, nor include those elements discussed above and set forth in independent claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 1 and 15, together with claims 2-14 and 16-23 depended therefrom, is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims and most earnestly solicits the issuance of a formal notice of allowability for the claims.